



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Because *'olah* is used with the verb *'alah*, we think that the noun must be cognate with the verb, and hence *'olah* must mean "that which is lifted up;" but it is quite possible that a verb of similar sound should be made to accompany a noun when not cognate, the ear, not the sense, directing; as when, in English, a gourmand after dinner says "I *feel full*," or an evil doer says "I *will well*, but I act ill." Now as *'olah* (burnt-offering) is written with a *warw* after the initial *'ayin* (i. e., with a fully-written long *o*)* four times in the Pentateuch, and forty-three times elsewhere, why may it not be the same as *'awlah*† (wickedness), which we find as *'olah* also in several places? I see no good reason why the *'olah* may not be the *wickedness*-offering, just as the *chatta'th* is the sin-offering, and the *'asham* is the trespass-offering. By the way, the word "offering" leads the English reader astray. It should not be appended to these presentations. *Qarabh qorban* means "to present a presentation." It is not giving a gift. The *minchah* is a gift, which God accepts after the presentation of an expiation.

There was just one idea in all bloody sacrifices,—*expiation by a suffering substitute*. The gifts and communion and consecration were all sequels and results.

The *somata*, in Rom. XII., 1, are our *sins* (see Col. III., 5 for the same idea) to be destroyed, not our souls to be consecrated.

THE PROPER ATTITUDE OF THE MINISTRY TOWARDS BIBLICAL CRITICS.

BY REV. B. F. SIMPSON,

Duluth, Minn.

It must be well-known that this form of biblical study and research known as the Higher Criticism is prominently before the reading public of to-day. Although certain phases of the subject can be properly dealt with only by an advanced scholarship, yet such is the importance of the question and the documents of which it treats, that it is of necessity a popular one. Men are thinking on this subject in all directions to-day. It meets us on every hand; and the question is not, Shall we pay any attention to it? We dare not ignore it; for that will be equivalent to a surrender of our position, whatever that position may be. The true question for us to ask to-day is, What shall be our position with respect to this department of inquiry, and

* עולה † עולה

what attitude shall we sustain towards those who are engaged in promoting it ?

On the one hand, some will be ready to say, Let this matter alone and it will come out all right. The truth is mighty and will prevail. These are very trite sayings ; and yet because they involve a subtle half-truth, they sound very well. Yet we are not to wait for things to "come out all right," but to see that we bring them out all right. The truth will prevail, if those who are set for its defense shall stand by it and exhibit it.

Some one will say this is a matter for specialists to consider. But may we not apprehend some danger in such a course as this ? It is true that the work of the specialist must be done. Some of it he alone can do ; but others must join him in achieving the broadest and best results. The specialist must lay open the furrows, and make ready the soil. Others may join him in bringing the harvest to maturity. The specialist sees objects too much in their isolation, whereas every object of thought, every discovered fact has its relations to other objects of thought and other facts, and should be viewed in the light of such relations. The specialist will always bear watching ; or better, he will always need assistance, and here lies the duty and opportunity of the minister. He is not supposed to be a specialist. He cannot well be one. But he is supposed to be a man of broad culture and good judgment, and in this matter such qualifications are of great value. The minister and the specialist must not condemn each other because they use different methods of inquiry, and arrive at results somewhat different. They must sympathize with each other ; they must be willing to use their intellectual capital as a common stock, that by a proper division of labor there may be a harmonious co-operation which will lead to the fullest and most speedy results. The critic's work is no child's play. It is work which is of great importance. It places him in a position of great responsibility with respect to the truth and authority of the sacred word ; and he should have the sympathies and prayers, rather than the frowns and anathemas of those who are so much interested in his work.

It is true that, in regard to the more strictly critical aspects of this question, the attitude of most men should be that of a modest silence. But few, comparatively, have made biblical research, in its critical and philological phases, enough of a study to speak intelligently on this point. Others should beware lest they bring discredit on their cause by an unscholarly defense of it. They should know that an ignorant defense of truth is more fatal to its interests than a sophistical opposition to it can be. They should know, moreover,

that the *onus probandi*, in this as in every case, devolves upon those who raise the question. When they have clearly demonstrated their positions we will be ready to accept them. Till then we will maintain a dignified silence.

In a recent number of one of our religious periodicals an anonymous writer gives his view of the attitude which we should assume towards all biblical criticism, as contained in the old Latin motto *obsta principiis*,—resist the first beginnings. It is well that this individual wrote anonymously, and did not put himself publicly on record as holding such a dangerous position. That method has been already tried too often, and its dire effects have taught most people that there must be a more excellent way. It avails nothing to-day to forbid investigation. In Protestant communities, at least, this is the case; and the only result which this denunciatory method can accomplish will be, on the one hand, to drive the critical investigators into still more extreme positions, while for the uncritical it will be the destruction of all progress in the proper understanding of truth.

Not many years ago some zealous defenders of biblical cosmogony, as they understood it, were ready to maintain that the world as it now is was made in six literal days, or else the Book of Genesis was not reliable history. This position was accepted by some and held so firmly that, when such a conception of creation became an absurdity, they had no alternative but to accept infidelity. There are some men to-day who will rashly affirm that, if the traditional views of the composition and structure of the Old Testament are not all correct, the whole Bible is unreliable. This I call a rash assertion; and yet it has sometimes come from men who regard themselves as careful students, if not profound scholars. This is surely a misfortune; and it is especially so when the writers of the New Testament, and even our Lord himself, are brought into this discussion and made responsible for the truth of such a view. Their treatment of the Old Testament made no pretensions of being critical. They quoted it in the freest manner possible. Evidently they had no scruples about a verbal inspiration. They do not take pains to give the exact words. They follow the Septuagint where it varies from the original text. At times their quotations are not literal translations of either the Hebrew text or the Septuagint. In quoting from the Psalms they use the common formula "David says," even though the particular psalm quoted may not be written by David. If it were absolutely necessary, as some have supposed, that the very language of the Bible should have been given by infallible inspiration, then, on the same grounds, it would be necessary that there should have been infallible transcribers, an in-

fallibly arranged canon, an infallible translation, and an infallible interpretation. We have none of these. Some of them, at least, we shall never have. It seems, then, that verbal inspiration is not so necessary as some have supposed, and we can forgive a New Testament writer if he gives us the general sense of a passage, without its exact words. Instead of affirming, *ex cathedra*, "If Moses did not write such words or such a passage, Jesus Christ was mistaken," it would be more prudent, as well as more modest, to say, "If Moses did not write the passage, I must change my view of the import of Christ's words."

We should meet these men as students desirous of knowing the truth as it is, and not in the attitude of polemics anxious to defend our view of what the truth should be. In this way we may soon come to a mutual understanding. In this way we shall find ourselves on a common ground with the critics, having common interests to subserve. We should not allow them to be more anxious to discover the whole truth than we are. It is as valuable to us as to them. All we shall ask is a fair and full search. We are not afraid that the truth will perish, or that its Author will be dethroned. We do not need to build bulwarks for its defense. All it needs is that it be discovered and exhibited, and its fitness will ensure its survival. Partial views of it, and the prejudices which support them, may pass away, "but the word of our God shall stand forever." It will stand; and it will commend itself more and more to an enlightened human reason as its wondrous depths of wisdom are better unfolded by a thorough and devout criticism.

To such an understanding of the word let the critics aid us. Let us look upon them, not as enemies, but as allies; and allies they will be. Let them correct for us the mistakes of transcribers and translators, that the errors of interpreters may also be corrected. If they show us that any of our ideas about the Bible have been wrong, it will be to our interest to have them righted. If they unfold for us some new phase of truth, it will be to our interest to accept it. In this way we will come nearer to them and will bring them nearer to us. In these matters we should have a common interest, and should mutually assist each other. Who does not know that there are interpolations to be removed and omissions to be filled up? Who does not know that any translation may be improved? Who wants to make his Bible a fetich to be worshiped, instead of an intelligible record which will teach him how to worship his Maker acceptably? Surely not any intelligent Christian. If any separate book can be shown to be uncanonical, who is not willing to carry a smaller Bible? If any book which

has not been thus far placed in the canon should be found to belong there, who will not enlarge his Bible enough to admit it? What we desire is the pure word of Jehovah, no more and no less. The Bible is a portrait of our Heavenly Father, and we desire all flaws and blemishes removed therefrom, that it may exhibit him distinctly. The Bible is a monument on which are inscribed the words and works of the Creator, and a just and wise criticism is to be the scaffolding by which we may climb to read and interpret the record. It would be folly for us to tear away the scaffolding on which we stand. It would be wisdom to assist in its further erection, that on it we may ascend to the very summit of revealed truth. We have nothing to lose, but every thing to gain from a true criticism. He who has learned, by practical experience, the truth of Revelation will not be easily alarmed. He who believes should not make haste. If this thing be of men, it will come to naught. If God is using this means to bring out the fuller light of his own truth, any opposition which we may offer will come to naught, and make us ridiculous in the eyes of men. Already discoveries in the realm of the various sciences have poured a flood of light on the Bible, or rather have drawn forth new beams of light from that book; perhaps a more abundant supply of that light still remains to be brought out in a similar way.

But, as already indicated, the burden of proof must rest upon those who raise the inquiry. Can they show that any radical changes are demanded in the present structure of the written word? Is language, known to be of a more recent origin, found in the Pentateuch? If so, let that fact be fully established, and then let it be shown how the integrity of the record is thereby affected. Can it be proved that, if writers in those early days sometimes signed other men's names to their compositions, any of the sacred penmen adopted this practice? If so, what was the effect on their writings? Can it be conclusively shown that names were given to individuals mentioned in the records after they had passed away and their characters were known, and not prophetically given in view of what their characters were to be? These are some of the important questions which the critics have raised, and it is their place to settle them beyond dispute, before they ask us to harmonize them with our views of the reliability and inspiration of the Bible. On such vital points assumption is presumptuous. Even plausible arguments will not suffice. We must demand clear demonstration.

Once more, while we will not discourage criticism, we should have something to say with respect to the method which it shall adopt, and the laws which should regulate it. The common rules of literary

criticism must be varied in their application to the Bible. It stands alone in literature, and its uniqueness has always been recognized. As well might the physical scientist attempt to discover the phenomena of mind by the use of the blowpipe or the retort, as may the mere grammatical and verbal critic expect to discover the fulness of revealed truth.

The biblical records are not narratives written according to the ordinary rules of composition. Really the Bible contains neither history nor biography, in the ordinary sense, but rather a series of sketches and pictures which, in a condensed outline, reveal great events and great characters. Surely the criticism of such a peculiar book must itself be peculiar. But, again, if the Bible be at all reliable as a record of historic facts, it certainly contains a supernatural element in it, and reveals the operation of a supernatural power. Here is an element of truth which can be but feebly represented in the forms of human speech, and must not be dealt with according to any arbitrary and mechanical laws of criticism. I mean, it must not be dealt with in a dogmatic way. Of course the usual laws must be applied by the critic, and as far as they apply, may be relied on.

In the common sense of the term, the Bible is not a scientific treatise. There is much said now-a-days about the harmony which is so soon going to be discovered between the teachings of Revelation and those of science. But these two departments of research are at present carried on on planes so widely separated from each other, and our knowledge of each is so crude, that this entire harmony will not soon be visible. When theologians, on the one hand, and scientists, on the other, can agree among themselves, it will be time enough to begin to look for a more general agreement. When will that time come? Certainly not in this generation.

Yet we must ever believe that a true science is not out of harmony with a true interpretation of the written word. And in the highest sense the science of sciences is that of religious truth, and the text-book of this loftier science is the Word of God. Geology is a science, though it does not disclose every thing contained in the earth. Astronomy is a science, although it reveals but a small part of the depths of space, and the orbs contained therein. And the Bible teaches a yet higher and deeper science, though the light which it casts thereon has not revealed to us as yet its infinite heights or its unfathomable depths. And while yet there is truth to be discovered, and light to break forth from the inspired page, we will welcome all help that can be given us towards a larger apprehension of yet uncomprehended truth.